

## REMARKS

Claims 1, 10, 18, 19, 29, 32 and 35 are currently amended. Claims 1-37 are pending in the application.

### *Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 103(a)*

Claims 1, 3-7, 9-15, 17-19, 28, 29 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,192,388 (**Cajolet**) in view of US 2002/0169606 (**Bantz**) and further in view of Official Notice. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 is discussed first. Claim 1 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, assigning the task from the task list to a remote system of the at least two remote systems that responds first to the indication that the task is available for processing, and wherein assigning the task is performed without comparing physical attributes of the at least two remote systems to each other. Support for the amendment is found in the Specification at page 16, lines 5-7. Applicants respectfully assert that **Cajolet**, **Bantz** and/or their combination fail to teach, among other things, assigning a task from a task list to a remote system without comparing physical attributes of the at least two remote systems to each other.

In an Examiner's Interview conducted on December 3, 2009, Applicants' representatives and the Examiner discussed possible amendments to the claims to overcome the cited prior art. (See Examiner's Interview Summary on page 2 of this paper). During the Interview, the Examiner and Applicants' representatives agreed that the claimed feature of "assigning the task is performed without comparing physical attributes of the at least two remote systems to each other" is not taught by **Cajolet** and/or **Bantz**, alone or in combination. Applicants respectfully submit that for at least this reason, as well as arguments presented during the course of this prosecution, claim 1 is allowable.

For at least these reasons, claim 1 and its dependent claims [2-9] are allowable. For at least similar reasons, claims 10, 18, 19, 29, 32 and 35 (and their respective dependent claims) are also allowable.

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

In light of the arguments presented above, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, **the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney** at the Houston, Texas telephone number (713) 934-4069 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

WILLIAMS, MORGAN & AMERSON, P.C.  
CUSTOMER NO. 23720

Date: December 7, 2009

By: /Jaison C. John/  
Jaison C. John, Reg. No. 50,737  
10333 Richmond, Suite 1100  
Houston, Texas 77042  
(713) 934-4069  
(713) 934-7011 (facsimile)  
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)